

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 9 are pending in the application. Claim 9 is allowed. Claim 3 is objected as being dependent from the rejected claim.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Examiner contends that the limitation “and other area” has insufficient antecedent basis and is not clear.

In response, claims 1, 2 and 4-8 have been amended to clarify the claimed language. In particular, the phrase “other area” is changed to --another transfer destination area--. It is noted that this language is consistent with the language of the allowed claim 9.

Further, claims 1, and 5-8 have been amended to make it clear that plural pieces of area information are acquired, and there is a plurality of transfer destination areas. It is noted that the amended language is consistent with the language of the allowed claim 9.

It is believed that the claims 1, 2 and 4-8, as now amended, fully comply with the statutory requirement to set out and circumscribe a subject matter area with a reasonable degree of precision and particularity.

In view of the foregoing, and in summary, claims 1-9 are considered to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

Application No.: 09/989,302

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Alexander V. Yampolsky
Registration No. 36,324

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 AVY:MWE
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: February 4, 2005

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**